



**AGENDA  
CITY OF BRYAN  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Wednesday, 8 June 2005**

**Regular Meeting – 5:30 p.m.  
Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 300 S. Texas Avenue**

---

1. Call to Order
2. Recognition of Visitors
3. Citizens to Be Heard on Items Not on Agenda
4. Recognition of Affidavits for Conflict of Interest
5. Consideration of Minutes—April 13, 2005 & April 21, 2005
6. Public Hearing and Consideration for **200 S. Main Street**  
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations
7. Public Hearing and Consideration for **210 N. Main Street**  
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations and addition
8. Commissioner and Staff Concerns
  - A. Individual Commissioners' Concerns
  - B. Items for Upcoming Agendas
9. Adjournment

**06/08/2005**  
**STATE OF TEXAS**  
**COUNTY OF BRAZOS**  
**CITY OF BRYAN**

On the 8th day of June 2005, the Historic Landmark Commission of the City of Bryan convened in an open session of their regular meeting in the City Council Chambers of the Bryan Municipal Building at 5:30 p.m. with the following in attendance:

Member	Today	Since Apptmt.	Since Apptmt.	Attended	Last 6 Mths	Last 6 Mths	Last 6 Mths
Dawn Jourdan	Yes	6	6	100%	*	*	*
James Ferguson	Yes	6	6	100%	*	*	*
Jim Hiney	No	29	27	93%	5	4	80%
Chad Grauke	Yes	6	5	83%	*	*	*
George Hester	Yes	17	15	88%	5	4	80%
James Crawley	Yes	6	5	83%	*	*	*
Sheila Fields	Yes	6	5	83%	*	*	*

Staff members present: Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner; Stephan Gage, Planning Intern.

**1. Call To Order**

Chairperson Hester called the meeting to order at 5:36 PM.

**2. Recognition Of Visitors**

There was one visitor: Mr. Lyle Witherell, of 1115 N. Timberland, Lufkin, TX 75901.

**3. Citizens To Be Heard**

There were none.

**4. Recognition Of Affidavits Filed In Response To State Law On Disclosure Of Local Official's Conflict Of Interest**

There were none.

**5. Consideration Of Minutes**

Approval of minutes from April 13, 2005 and April 21, 2005.

Commissioner Grauke made a motion to approve the minutes of April 13, 2005, as presented, and Commissioner Jourdan seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Grauke asked that the word "staircase" be struck, and the phrase "Conlee Building" be changed to "Charles Hotel" for item 13 on page of the April 21, 2005 minutes.

Commissioner Grauke asked that the word "substantially" be added between the words "without" and "impacting" for item 15 on page 2 of the April 21, 2005 minutes.

Commissioner Fields made a motion to approve the minutes of April 21, 2005, as corrected, and Commissioner Crawley seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

## **6. Public Hearing/Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness 200 S. Main Street**

### *Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations*

Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner, presented the staff report (on file in Planning Services). Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the applicant is requesting additional changes to the handrail design of the exterior staircases on the north and south facades of the building at 200 South Main street. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that on February 23, 2005, the Commission initially approved modifications to the handrails of the same exterior staircases. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission of the following:

1. The proposed design is similar to other recently constructed staircases in the District; and,
2. The proposed handrail design is appropriate as it is more reflective of the ornamentation on the fire escape landing which once existed on the north façade of the building; and,
3. The proposed modification will bring the staircase into compliance with current building codes because the stair rails will be moved closer together to accommodate the proposed ornaments; and,
4. The ornaments will be painted the same color as the stair rails.

The Commission discussed the following with staff:

1. Was the first request denied [*tabled*] at the special meeting on April 21, 2005; and,

Staff affirmed that the initial modification request was presented at the April 21, 2005 meeting.

2. Was the reason that the request was denied [*tabled*] because the stair rails were too far apart; and,

Staff responded that the reason the initial modification request was denied [*tabled*] was because the Commission felt the handrail design was utilitarian and inappropriate for a building located along a major gateway into Downtown Bryan.

3. Will the only modification be the addition of the scroll ornamentation; and,

Staff affirmed that the only modification would be the addition of the scroll ornamentation.

4. What will final staircase look like; and,

Staff explained that the final staircase will resemble the staircase design approved on February 23, 2005, minus the stair landing rail designs, with modified stair rails and the added scroll ornamentation.

Commissioner Crawley made a motion to postpone consideration of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 S. Main until after consideration of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 210 North Main, and Commissioner Fields seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

### ***After the consideration of the (Item #7) Certificate of Appropriateness for 210 North Main Street:***

The public hearing was opened.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Grauke made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 S. main Street due to the inadequacy of the submitted documents and the lack of an owner or representative to answer questions, and Commissioner Jourdan seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

## **7. Public Hearing/Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness for 210 N. Main Street**

*Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations and addition*

Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner, presented the staff report (on file in Planning Services). Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the applicant is in the process of purchasing the property located at 210 North Main Street, previously known as Downtown Pharmacy, and the applicant is proposing signage for the new business which will be known as Brookshire Brothers Pharmacy. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission of the following:

1. The applicant is proposing two alternatives for signage on the front Main Street façade of the building; and,
2. The first preference includes salvaging and retrofitting a 50+ year old neon pharmacy sign with the Brookshire Brothers logo; and,
3. The sign is currently 31 square feet in size and is approximately 5 feet height by 7 feet wide; and,
4. The sign agent has indicated that the sign can be cut down to a size deemed appropriate by the Commission; and,
5. The second preference would be to replace the existing red plastic letters, which read "Downtown Pharmacy", with red wooden letters reading "Brookshire Brothers Pharmacy"; and,
6. The combined total area of the individual wooden letters would be approximately 10 square feet; and,
7. The proposed second preference signage would be placed in the bricked rectangle detail above the existing canopy and transom windows; and,
8. The Bryan Avenue façade of the building will be repainted with the words "Brookshire Brother Pharmacy", and all paint color will be approved by staff; and,
9. Although the Design Guidelines list projecting signs as appropriate for Downtown, the Historic Preservation Ordinance gives no specifications for such signage; and,
10. The Commission has the authority to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and any appeals will be forward to City Council; and,
11. Any other legal issues relating to the sign will be deferred to the Chief Building Official with the right to appeal to the Board of Sign Controls; and,
12. Retrofitted neon signage has been permitted in the Downtown Historic District; and,
13. The retrofitted historic neon sign proposed by the applicant is an appropriate signage for the Downtown Historic District; and,
14. Staff finds that the applicant's alternate proposal is also appropriate should the Commission deny a COA for the projecting sign; and,
15. Repainting the existing sign on the rear of the building is also appropriate as the size of the painted area will not be increased.

The Commission discussed the following with Staff:

1. Is the proposed projecting neon sign double-sided and will it be mounted perpendicular to the building; and,

Staff responded that the sign was double-sided and would be installed perpendicular to the building.

2. Will the sign be installed in the center of the front façade; and,

Staff affirmed that the sign would be installed in the center of the front façade.

3. What colors will the sign be painted; and,

Staff responded that the applicant's agent would address sign colors during the public hearing.

4. Could the Commission regulate sign illumination levels and hours of operation; and,

Staff responded that the Commission can not regulate sign illumination or hours of operation because such authority is not provided in the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

5. Will the letter of the alternative front façade sign fit within the architectural detail on the front façade?

Staff affirmed that the letters of the alternative front façade sign would fit inside the architectural detail located above the canopy and transom windows.

6. When was the last neon sign installed in the Downtown Historic District?

Staff responded that the last retrofitted neon sign installed Downtown was for the Hotel Charles in July 2004.

The public hearing was opened.

Lyle Witherell, of 1115 N. Timberland, Lufkin, TX, informed the Commission of the following:

1. He is the applicant's agent; and,
2. He has color photographs of the proposed sign to share with the Commission.

The Commission discussed the following with Mr. Witherell:

1. How will the sign's size be reduced; and,

Mr. Witherell replied that he would remove the angles on each corner of the sign face.

2. Will the sign retain its shape after the size reduction; and,

Mr. Witherell affirmed that the sign's shape would remain the same after the size was reduced.

3. Will the sign blink or flash; and,

Mr. Witherell responded that the sign will not blink or flash and the neon letters can be removed entirely if that is what the Commission desires.

4. Does the owner want the sign to have neon letters; and,

Mr. Witherell responded that the owner wants neon letters on the sign.

5. What colors will be used on the painted sign on the rear façade?

Mr. Witherell responded that the sign will be white with red letters.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Jourdan made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriate for 210

North Main Street, utilizing the proposed first preference signage on the front façade and the proposed painted sign on the rear facade, and Commissioner Grauke seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed the following:

1. The proposed first preference sign is very interesting and is a piece of history which takes one back in time; and,
2. The sign will enhance the nighttime presence of Downtown in a historic way; and,
3. The owners of the pharmacy should be commended for their efforts to find and restore such a sign.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

## **8. Commissioner And Staff Concerns**

### **A. Individual Commissioner's Concerns**

Commissioner Jourdan reported that she would be out of town for the next two weeks.

Commissioner Hester asked why special meetings are scheduled.

Staff responded that while they try to avoid scheduling special meetings, they also try to be as accommodating as possible to COA applicants.

Commissioner Hester stated he felt that special meetings were typically unnecessary, and that the Commission should adhere to their regularly scheduled meeting dates.

Commissioner Hester stated the he will be out of town on the date of the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Commissioner Jourdan commented that there may be circumstances which warrant a special meeting and the Commission should either identify these circumstances or allow Staff to decide when such meetings should be called.

Commissioner Ferguson stated the he will be out of town on the date of the next regularly scheduled meeting.

### **B. Items for Upcoming Agendas**

Staff reported the following:

1. The Historic Preservation Ordinance subcommittee met last week and has made substantial progress; and,
2. The new Assistant City Attorney has taken on responsibility for rewriting the ordinance; and,
3. The new Assistant City Attorney will attend all future meetings of the Historic Landmark Commission.

## **9. Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 S. Main Street (Item tabled at the April 21, 2005 Meeting)**

*Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations*

Commissioner Ferguson made of motion to take from the table the Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 S. Main Street presented at the April 21, 2005 meeting, and Commissioner Fields seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Grauke made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 S.

Main Street presented at the April 21, 2005 meeting, and Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

#### **10. Adjournment**

Commissioner Grauke made the motion to adjourn, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Ferguson.

There being no other business, the June 8<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission adjourned at 6:15 PM.

THESE MINUTES SHALL SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL FINDINGS OF THE HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION, AS APPROVED THIS 27th DAY OF JULY, 2005.

***Signature of File***

---

Chairperson of the Historic Landmark Commission